

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 6, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-49 were pending and rejected all claims. Claims 1, 25, 28, 31 and 44-49 have been amended and new claims 50-53 have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-53 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

The Examiner objected to the specification and required an update of the related applications section. This has been done.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract and required correction. The Abstract has been corrected responsive to the Examiner's comments.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 25-28, 32, 33 and 44-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Straus.

As depicted in figure 7 of Straus, a zone boundary 42 that causes the region to move in Straus is greatly displaced from the menu tool bar 40. In contrast, the claims 1, 25, 28, 31 and 44-49 are directed to a tracking menu where the tracking boundary coincides with the menu boundary while claim 32 emphasizes that the edge of the menu causes the movement.

It is submitted that the present claims patentably distinguish over Straus and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Pages 11-23 of the Office Action rejects claims 5, 8, 9, 13, 16-19, 24, 29-31 and 34-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Straus with lweme, Hoeber or Nicholas or combinations thereof.

These references add nothing to Straus with respect to the futures of the claims discussed above.

It is submitted that the independent claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

New claim 50 emphasizes that the movement of the menu happens when not dragging where in Straus movement happens only while dragging. Straus's menu contains choices to modify an already invoked command not choices to select a command as is emphasized in new claim 51. New claim 52 emphasizes the edge of the menu causes the movement. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that these new claims, which are different and not narrower than prior filed claims distinguish, over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 5, 2007

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501